



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

## XVI.—THE LITURGICAL BASIS OF THE TOWNELEY MYSTERIES.

The Towneley Mysteries have two remarkable characteristics which have attracted the attention of scholars: they contain a number of plays borrowed directly from the York cycle and they also contain a number of other plays so conspicuous for their highly dramatic form that the cycle may be said to have reached in them the highest point in the dramatic development of the English Mystery. Various theories have been advanced to account for the presence of these two sets of plays in Towneley and especially for the relationship, and its extent, of Towneley and York. The two theories of greatest interest are those of Professor Davidson<sup>1</sup> and Professor Hohlfeld.<sup>2</sup> A third, advanced by Mr. Pollard,<sup>3</sup> is practically the same as Professor Hohlfeld's, with one or two slight modifications, which hardly concern us here.

Professor Davidson's theory is, in one respect, peculiar. He thinks the Towneley cycle to be the work of a single compiler, working in couplets and quatrains, and drawing his plays from various sources. Subsequent studies of the nature of the cycles, however, have proved them to be, not the work of single editors, but a growth, a gradual accumulation of the work of a number of editors. A closer examination of the cycle reveals the fact that Davidson's editor working in couplets and quatrains was in reality two, one using couplets, and the other quatrains, and that a considerable interval of time separated them.

<sup>1</sup> Davidson, *English Mystery Plays* (*Yale Thesis*, 1892), p. 129.

<sup>2</sup> *Anglia*, xi, 219 ff. "Die altenglischen Kollektivmysterien, etc."

<sup>3</sup> Introduction to *The Towneley Plays*, E. E. T. S. edition.

There is, in fact, evidence here of a certain amount of growth.

The Hohlfeld-Pollard theory, on the other hand, partially recognizes the fact of growth within the cycle. It attempts to answer two questions: What is the extent and nature of the relationship between York and Towneley? —What is the relationship between the two groups which give Towneley its importance?<sup>1</sup> Hohlfeld has made a careful comparison of Towneley and York, play by play, and arrives at the following grouping of the T plays in regard to their relationship with Y:—<sup>2</sup>

1. Word for word borrowing of entire plays: Plays 8, 18, 25, 26, 30.
2. A general imitation of entire plays with a borrowing of isolated passages: Pl. 10, 14, 15.
3. A general imitation of entire plays without the presence of parallel passages: Pl. 16, 20.
4. A word for word borrowing of certain parts and a general imitation of others: Pl. 22.
5. General imitation of isolated portions: Pl. 21.
6. Parallel passages without other agreement: Pl. 23.
7. Without direct evidence of any influencing by Y: Pl. 1, 2, 3, 7, 11, 12, 13, 17, 19, 21, 27, 28, 31, 32.
8. Not present in Y: Pl. 5, 6, 9, 24.

Without going into the question of the correctness of this grouping, it is to be noted that Hohlfeld found, generally speaking, that Y had influenced T in two ways. First, there were the direct borrowings, and, second, there was a certain amount of what seemed to him general imi-

<sup>1</sup> The first of these may, for convenience, be called the York, or Y group; the second because of references which it contains, to Wakefield, the Wakefield, or W group.

<sup>2</sup> *Anglia*, xi, 307.

tation, extending in certain plays to the borrowing of isolated phrases. His conclusion upon these data is<sup>1</sup> that the original author (*Verfasser*), of T was a man who was acquainted with Y, from which he made the direct borrowings. In certain cases he did not have a copy of the plays, but constructed from his recollection of the structure of Y, incorporating such phrases as he could remember. In other cases he seems to have written independently. He always followed biblical sources closely. He was followed by another author, who wrote, with little reference to biblical sources, the humorous plays to which T owes its greater interest. Mr. Pollard modifies this view, giving three stages of growth instead of two, by placing in a first or earliest stage those plays in which Hohlfeld finds no direct relationship between T and Y.<sup>2</sup> So much for theories concerning Towneley alone.

There is a third theory of the highest importance to the present discussion: the general theory of cyclic growth advanced by Mr. E. K. Chambers. In the light of this theory, it will be possible to discover the limitations of the other two just described. Chambers's theory is later than the two just given. It is applied to no special cycle, but attempts to outline a course of development which is common to all. Hohlfeld<sup>3</sup> and Davidson,<sup>4</sup> as well as other scholars, recognize that the ultimate source of the cycles was in the liturgy of the church; but they do not concern themselves with tracing the connection between the liturgical and the guild plays with any exactness. It remained for Chambers to collect the data upon this larger question. A statement of his conclusions is a statement

<sup>1</sup> *Anglia*, xi, 307 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *The Towneley Plays*, Introduction, xxvii, xxviii.

<sup>3</sup> *Anglia*, xi, 239. Davidson, p. 6, etc.

of his theory.<sup>1</sup> He believes that the growth of the cycles is a literary evolution embracing three periods:—

1. *Liturgical*. The development within the liturgy of plays on Christ's Birth, Resurrection, and possibly his Passion.

2. *Transitional*. The secularization of these plays by translation into the vernacular and by enlargement, either within already existing scenes, or by the addition of new scenes from biblical or apocryphal history; until the cycle came to embrace the whole cosmic order from Creation to Judgment. The completion of this historic cycle closes this period.

3. *Final*. Secularization of the plays is complete. They are in the hands of the guilds, where they remain, suffering constant change; acted now by one trade, now by another; re-written and re-arranged to suit new conditions; but firmly fixed in the cyclic form.

Emphasis must be placed upon the fact that this growth is an evolution. The limits of the periods are not sharply defined. They merge into each other. Not all cycles reached the full development, nor did all grow with the same rapidity.

It is evident at once that both Hohlfeld and Davidson have approached the question of Towneley's growth from a different point of view than would have been probable, if they had been acquainted with Chambers's theory. Their field of vision is narrower. To their minds the growth of Towneley is a question of definite authors or compilers. For them, the cycle did not grow normally out of its liturgical source. They recognized that, generally speaking, the ultimate source of all cyclic plays must have been the liturgy, but they did not seem to realize

<sup>1</sup> E. K. Chambers, *The Mediæval Stage*, vol. 2, chap. xviii-xxii.

that the ultimate source of this very Towneley cycle might well have been specific liturgical plays from which the present cycle had developed by gradual growth; a growth in which all questions of editors or of compilers can refer only to the final stages. For the cycle, as it now exists, exists in the final stages of its development. The plays which make it up are none of them liturgical or transitional in form. In other words, the theories of Davidson and Hohlfeld do not look beyond the Final, or at most the Final and late Transitional stages of growth, as given by Chambers. It would not be strange if this narrower view of the case has led to a misapprehension of the facts; or at least has laid open to question the conclusions at which Hohlfeld and Davidson have arrived.

Hohlfeld bases his theory upon the following facts.

1. Certain plays are borrowed directly from York.
2. Others resemble York closely in general structure and arrangement; some of these contain parallel phraseology in places.
3. Certain other plays show a dramatic power much in advance of the rest of the cycle. It is upon the first two that he has based that part of his theory which assigns most of the plays to an author acquainted with York, who worked in three ways: either writing on a York framework; or borrowing directly from York; or doing independent, original work of his own. Laying aside the question whether one author would use such remarkably divergent methods, especially in a day of little originality, it is apparent, when we come to consider, in the light of Chambers's theory, the facts which Hohlfeld has discovered, that a legitimate question may be raised concerning the second. May not the resemblance in general arrangement, we may ask, have arisen from a common liturgical source of which the parallel phraseology

is a remnant in translation, surviving through years of independent growth? It is out of this interesting question that the main inquiry of the present paper has developed.

Turning to Davidson's theory, we find it to be based upon a single fact. He discovered that certain quatrains and couplets seemed to be an editor's work and concluded that this man compiled the cycle as it now is. This theory takes no account of any theory of growth. It asks no questions as to the method by which the various plays attained such a development that the compiler could make use of them in his cycle. It simply suggests that he collected them. That this theory should have been advanced by Davidson is rather surprising, since he devotes a good part of his discussion to tracing the development of the guild plays from the liturgical, and, in fact, finds evidence of this development in certain isolated scenes in Towneley and York.<sup>1</sup>

These two theories are thus found to be limited to Chambers's Final Period. The present discussion, on the other hand, will concern itself primarily with his first period. It will deal with the question of Towneley's liturgical source and is, therefore, of necessity, limited to those portions of Towneley, which according to Chambers's theory, might have had a liturgical source, leaving for another time any discussion of plays possibly, or obviously,

<sup>1</sup> Davidson, pp. 6 ff. I have already remarked that Davidson's compiler is in reality two editors, one using couplets and the other quatrains (see above, p. 419). It is of importance to note that the couplet man has worked only in the two groups (of the Hohlfeld-Pollard grouping) which do not contain direct borrowings from York. These borrowings contain no couplets, whereas all three groups contain quatrains, and they are especially characteristic of the York borrowings. The inference from this is that, contrary to Hohlfeld's idea, the borrowings are the last addition to the cycle.

Transitional or Final additions to the cycle. The problem is: Is the liturgical source of Towneley traceable? If traceable, how extensive was it? And in addition to these questions another may be asked, to which the exigencies of the argument will compel an answer: Are there any other extant cycles in which the same liturgical source is traceable? These questions are fundamental. Once they are answered, it ought to be possible to proceed to a coherent tracing of the complete course of development through which Towneley passed.

For the solution of the problem raised in these questions certain things are necessary. On the side of the theory there must be a careful limitation of each of the three stages of cyclic growth, that they may be easily distinguished. On the side of the cycle, there must be some opportunity for comparison with other cycles; a comparison through which Transitional and Final accretions may, if possible, be eliminated. Such a cycle we have in York, with its many affinities to Towneley already noted by Hohlfeld and others.<sup>1</sup> Such a cycle, it will appear, we have also in the fragment of true Coventry left to us. The indications of such a cycle we have in the Beverley list of cyclic plays, which bears a striking resemblance to the lists of Y, T, and true Cov.

A comparison such as I have indicated should result, if the cycles have a common liturgical source only, in the discovery of a common fundamental framework. But, that the comparison may be successful, it is obvious that certain cautions must be observed and some definite standard for determining a common liturgical source must be evolved. In order to do this, a rather more elaborate

<sup>1</sup> See above, pp. 419 ff.

description of the limits and nature of each of Chambers's periods must be made.<sup>1</sup>

The Liturgical Period closed, strictly speaking, when translation into the vernacular commenced. In isolated cases the vernacular and Latin may both have been used in the service. Such the rubrics would indicate to be the nature of the Resurrection Fragments discovered by Professor Skeat at Shrewsbury.<sup>2</sup> But these isolated instances only emphasize the rule, a rule of great importance in the comparisons we are to undertake. For the presence of common rhymes in two texts of the same scene which are under comparison would indicate a common source in the vernacular, and therefore a common source from either the Transitional or Final Periods; whereas two texts derived from a common liturgical source would contain a similar development of the thought, and possibly similar phrases arising from translation of the same original, but hardly any number of similar rhymes.

The liturgical period, then, is characterized by the use of Latin. In addition to this, it is necessary to define both its limits and the typical form of the liturgical plays. The earliest, or Resurrection Play, attained considerable development within the liturgy, containing scenes from the time the Jews warn Pilate that the tomb should be guarded, up to and including the Resurrection, and thereafter through the appearance to Mary, the Walk to Emmaus, and the Appearance to Thomas. Instead of being split up into a number of plays, this liturgical drama was a single play with a number of scenes. Internal development was subsequently to enlarge these scenes to such an extent that the single play broke up into a number of

<sup>1</sup> For detailed discussion see Chambers, vol. II.

<sup>2</sup> *Academy* (London), Jan. 11, 1890.

plays centering around the Resurrection. But this is a Transitional development. It is important to remember that in the liturgy these plays were simply scenes of one long play written in Latin. These facts have an important bearing upon the cyclic development. Because of them any divergence from type in a liturgic play could generally arise in only three ways: (1) the order of the scenes might be changed; (2) new scenes might be added; (3) old scenes might be dropped. The exigencies of the Latin text and the church service would prohibit much lengthening of scenes by extending the dialogue.

The second, or Christmas Play, centering around Christ's birth, also attained considerable development within the liturgy. By the close of the liturgical period it may be assumed to include scenes from the coming of the Shepherds to worship, through the Flight into Egypt.

In connection with the Christmas service there grew up another play called the *Prophetae*, which has an important bearing upon the present discussion. It was originally a sermon, a portion of which purported to give prophecies of the coming Christ by sacred and profane historical characters. This portion was subsequently dialogued and then dramatized, so that out of it developed a series of incidents, like that of Balaam and his Ass, connected with Old Testament history. From them was evolved a series of Old Testament plays. This was the usual development.<sup>1</sup> In certain cases, however, Chambers found the *Prophetae* as a prologue to the *Stella*, in which the main prophecies are hurriedly reviewed. This seems to have been the case in Towneley, York, and true Coventry. The greatest development of the *Prophetae* must necessarily have been Transitional.

<sup>1</sup> Chambers, vol. 2, pp. 52 ff.

Chambers finds few indications of a Passion play within the Liturgy, though the earliest Passion Play in existence is wholly in Latin and remarkably like a liturgical play.

Such are the limits of the liturgical plays, as Chambers lays them down. It must be remembered, however, that this is a general theory, and that particular examples may show more or less variation from type.

The growth during the Transitional and Final Periods may be summarized with much less detail. Development within the liturgy was mainly confined to the addition of scenes to older plays. This continues in Transition. New scenes are added. A Passion Play appears. The Prophetae develops into a series of Old Testament plays from the Fall of Lucifer down. The events of the Christmas play are linked to those of the Passion by scenes from Christ's life. A Harrowing of Hell connects Passion and Resurrection, and all is closed by a play on the Judgment. The cycle is filled out. But the use of the vernacular gives a chance for dialogue before impossible. Conversations are elaborated. Scenes which were merely dumb show are invested with a dialogue and drawn out to a great length. Comedy develops. The liturgical plays, long in themselves, become inordinately long and split up, each scene becoming a separate play. The Final Period begins when, completely separated from the church, the plays are handed over to the guilds, there to go through constant editing and shifting until interest in them finally dies out and they are abandoned.

From all this may be deduced certain obvious cautions with regard to a comparison that attempts to bring out similarity in liturgical source.

1. Not all the plays could by any possibility have developed from the liturgy.

2. The chief indication of liturgical source will be a

similar framework in the texts compared, running, not through single plays in a series, but through the whole series of plays which may have made up the scenes of a single liturgical play, whether Christmas or Resurrection.

3. This framework may or may not be indicated by similar phraseology. In those scenes where there has been simply translation from the original, with little enlargement, there may be considerable similar phraseology. But if enlargement has taken place, the similar phrases may be only tags or catchwords, remaining from the original episode.

4. This similar phraseology must not contain rhymes common to the compared texts. The presence of rhymes is evidence of a vernacular, that is a Transitional, source.

With these cautions in mind we may state our rule for determining a common liturgical source. If it is possible to discover running through the plays of the same liturgical group in two or more cycles a common fundamental framework upon which all the variations in each cycle have been superimposed, we are warranted in assuming, for that group in these cycles, a common liturgical source. Our assumption is strengthened if a similar phraseology exists which corresponds in a more or less fragmentary way to the development of the story as it is shown in the common framework.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Concerning these similar phrases it may be objected that they are nothing more than translations of the same biblical source, rather than of a liturgical original. And in some scenes this would appear to be the case, were it not that in other scenes they show a common variation from the Bible story, which is evidently originally a liturgical variation. It must be remembered, in this connection, that each of these plays is but a scene in a long liturgical play, which is much elaborated, and must be considered in its relation to the other scenes of the play.

We come, then, to consider the growth of Towneley in the light of Chambers's theory. The method will be by a comparison with York and true Coventry, which will incidently help us to some conclusions concerning those two cycles as well as Towneley.

According to the limits for the liturgical plays laid down by Chambers, those of Towneley which may have grown from a liturgical source are: from the *Christmas Play*, plays xi through xvi (Shepherds, Magi, Flight into Egypt, Herod the Great); from the *Resurrection Play*, plays xxvi, xxvii, xxviii (The Resurrection, containing also an Appearance to Mary, The Pilgrims to Emmaus, and Thomas of India). It will be convenient to consider the Christmas series first.

#### THE CHRISTMAS PLAYS.

A glance at the titles of the plays preceding and following those mentioned above as possibly the scenes of the liturgical play out of which T developed, shows that they do not include all the plays in T upon events connected with Christ's birth and childhood. The series commences with play x on the Annunciation and runs through play xviii, Christ with the Doctors in the Temple. On the strength of Chambers's theory alone we have no right to include any but plays xii through xvii in our comparison of T, Y, and true Cov. But we must remember that Chambers's theory is general and from it particular cycles may in some measure vary. This consideration would lead us to include all of the Christmas plays in T in our comparison, in order to see whether any variation from type may be discovered in Towneley. The most superficial examination of the titles of scenes in York and

true. Cov. reveals a similarity which further impels us to this examination. The scenes of the Christmas plays in the three cycles are:—

<i>Towneley</i> : Pl. 10-18.	<i>York</i> : Pl. 12-20.	<i>Coventry</i> : <i>Shear.</i> <i>Tailors; Weav.</i>
10. Prophetic Prologue. Annunciation.	12. Prophetic Prologue. Annunciation.	1. Shearmen and Tailors. Prophetic Prologue. Annunciation.
Joseph's Trouble about Mary.	13. Joseph's Trouble about Mary.	Joseph's Trouble.
11. Salutation of Elizabeth.	14. Birth of Jesus.	Birth of Jesus.
12 and 13. The two Shepherds Plays.	15. The Shepherds.	Shepherds.
14. The Magi.	16, 17. The Magi.	The Magi.
15. Flight into Egypt.	18. Flight into Egypt.	Flight into Egypt.
16. Herod The Great (The Innocents).	19. Innocents.	Innocents.
17. Purification of Mary.	41. Purification.	2. Weavers' Play. Purification.
18. Christ with the Doctors in the Temple.	20. The Doctors.	The Doctors.

It is evident from this list that the extent of the group in the three cycles is practically the same. Discrepancies may be noted as follows:—

1. The Salutation of Elizabeth precedes Joseph's Trouble in York, follows it in Towneley, is not present in Coventry.
2. Towneley contains no account of the Birth, but does contain two Shepherds plays. In Coventry the Shepherds play and the Birth are linked together in the following order: scene one of the Shepherds play, one of the Birth; a second Shepherds scene, a second Birth scene.
3. The group consists in T of nine plays; in York of ten, one of which, the Purification, is out of place;<sup>1</sup> in Coventry of two.

<sup>1</sup> Miss L. T. Smith, *The York Plays*, Introduction, p. xxi, and note, p. 433.

Of the three, Coventry has the more primitive form, since the original liturgical play has remained almost intact, only two scenes having broken away. The discussion of Chambers has shown that the direction of growth was towards the separation, rather than towards the grouping, of scenes. This is an indication that the transitional growth of Coventry was very incomplete. It seems almost to have stood still for a long period. The other discrepancies noted above will be considered later. The one thing especially noteworthy is that the comparison reveals a marked similarity in the titles in these three cycles. Whatever value this comparison may have is increased upon examination of other cycles, Chester and so-called Coventry, which, while they reveal a superficial similarity in title, do not show so close a similarity to any of these three as these do to each other. That this is true will develop during the discussion.

Unless the general similarity were supported by weightier reasons, the comparison might well stop here. But it is noteworthy that of the plays mentioned above<sup>1</sup> in which Hohlfeld finds a general imitation of York by Towneley, either with or without borrowing of isolated passages, four (10, 14, 15, 16), are in this group, and all but one in the limited portion of the group which Chambers's theory would lead us to think liturgical in source. Of course, if Hohlfeld's theory of general borrowing from Y be not admitted, his general imitation becomes a general similarity, and a general similarity is the first of our tests for a liturgical source. That one of these plays, 10, is the first of the extant T series of Christmas scenes, would lead us to a more extensive investigation of the whole series, rather than of plays 12 to 16 alone.

<sup>1</sup> See page 420.

But so far the discussion of these general points has produced no reason, other than similarity in titles of scenes, why true Coventry should be included in the comparison. There is still another characteristic which links these three cycles together and at the same time distinguishes them from all other English Mystery plays. They each have, as noted in the list of titles, a prologue of prophets prefixed to the first of their Christmas scenes, the Annunciation. So peculiar is this characteristic that it has been the basis of considerable discussion and considerable tracing of relationships, by borrowing, between the cycles.<sup>1</sup> But I have already mentioned the fact that Chambers<sup>2</sup> discovered two distinct developments of the Prophetae, one into the series of Old Testament plays and the other into the prologue to the Stella, or Christmas play. Can the presence of such a prologue in each of these three cycles, and in no others, be a mere coincidence? In this connection is it not a remarkable fact that it has been impossible to discover any evidence of Old Testament Plays in connection with true Coventry?<sup>3</sup> Is not the fact of a similar prophetic prologue in Y and T, when coupled with the fact of absolutely dissimilar Old Testament plays, a hint that Y and T developed from the same liturgical source? And is not the presence of the prologue in Coventry, coupled with the absence of Old Testament plays, a hint that, in any comparison for determining the liturgical relationships of Y and T, true Coventry should be included? Does not the fact that this prophetic prologue is prefixed to the Annunciation

<sup>1</sup> See Davidson and Hohlfeld.

<sup>2</sup> Chambers, vol. 2, pp. 52 ff.

<sup>3</sup> While T and Y coincide in the titles of the Old Testament scenes through Abraham and Isaac, they disagree thereafter, and where they coincide in title the framework differs.

furnish an indication that the whole series from Annunciation through the Flight should be included in the comparison, especially when this series is only one play in Coventry?

This analysis and comparison of the Christmas series in Y, T, and true Cov. will endeavor to show the probability that this series in each of the three cycles is a development under differing circumstances from the same liturgical source. But it must be remembered that such evidence as may be offered, wholly internal as it is, can establish no more than a probability, which can be argued for, but never positively proved. It points towards a theory but does not determine a fact.

To bring out more clearly the points of this comparison, a corresponding liturgical play is given, as far as there is such a play extant. As the liturgical play is only similar to, and not the direct source of, the cyclic play, there is not exact agreement in any one case. Nor has it been thought necessary to use the same play throughout. Rather, scenes from different plays, which correspond most exactly to the cyclic play, have been chosen. For the scenes up to the Shepherds, a Benedictbeuern play,<sup>1</sup> containing a prophetic prologue, has been used. For the Shepherds and Magi, and also for the Innocents, use has been made of a Magi from Fleury.<sup>2</sup> For the Flight a Freising<sup>3</sup> play has been used because it is more detailed.

There is, of course, a certain amount of divergence in each cycle, due in large part to constant re-editing. There has been, besides enlargement of certain scenes, some shifting in the order and a certain amount of omission. As it is the purpose of this paper to discover whether, amidst

<sup>1</sup> Du Méril, *Origines Latines du Théâtre Moderne*, p. 187.

<sup>2</sup> Du Méril, pp. 162, 175.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 171.

SCENE 1, THE ANNUNCIATION.

Coventry, Shearmen and Tailors.<sup>1</sup>

1. Prologue by Isaye. (1-46)<sup>2</sup>

Man having fallen by Adam's sin and the Serpent's guile, a maiden shall bear a son who shall redee

2. Annunciation.

*Gabriel.*

Hayle, Mare, full of grace!  
Owre Lord God ys with the.  
(47-48)

3. Mary expresses wonder. (51-54)

*Gab.* Dred the nothyng, meydin,  
of this; (55)

Wherefore in the grace schalbe  
fownde; (61)  
For thou schalt consevye apon  
this grownde (62)

4. *Mary.* I marvell soore how thatt  
mabe. (68)

Manus cumpany knew I neyuer  
yett,

5. *Gab.* The Wholle Gost in the  
schall lyght, (72)

6. *Gab.* Beholde Eylesabeth thy  
cosyn clene, (82)

7. *Mary.* Asse his one hande-  
mayde I submyt me. (91)

York, Pl. 12, scene 1.

Prologue. (st. 1-12).

Towneley, Pl. 10, st. 1-14.

1. Prologue by Deus. (st. 1-  
lines).

*Ang.* Hayle! Marie! full of grace  
and blysse, (13)

Oure Lord God is with þe,

Mary expresses wonder (13)

*Ang.* Ne drede þe noght, þou mylde  
marie

Consayue and bere a childe þou sall,  
(14)

*Mary.* Howe sulde it be, I the praye,  
I knawe no man. . . . (16)

*Ang.* The Halygast in þe sall lighte,  
(17)

*Ang.* Loo, Elyzabeth, þi cosyne,

*Mary.* Goddis handmayden, lo! me  
here, (18)

2. Annunciation.

*Ang.* hayll, Mary, and w  
thou! (3)

My lord of heuen is wyth th  
wythouten end;

3. No interruption by Mary.

*Ang.* Goodly lady, haue thou  
dred,

That I command; (3)

Thou shall conceyue within t  
sydys

A chyld of myght. (4)

4. *Mary.* How shuld it be? (7)

. . . . . . . . . . .

I cam neuer by man's syde, (8)

5. *Ang.* The holy gost shall lig  
in the, (10)

6. *Ang.* And se, Mary, (11)  
Elesabeth, thi cosyne, that is ca  
geld,

7. *Mary.* I am his maydn at h  
hand. (13)

<sup>1</sup> The text of true Coventry used is that found in Manly, *Specimens of the Pre-Shaksperean Drama*, vol. 1, pp. 120 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Figures in ( ) indicate stanzas in Y and T, lines in Cov.

Benedictbeuern.

(st. 1-76      A long dialogued prologue.

all redeem Adam and all his race.

and well      *Ang.* Ave Maria, gratia plena, Dominus tecum, (Luke, I. 28)

is wyth the,  
d;

Mary.      *Ang.* Ecce conceipies, et paries. etc.  
we thou no      (Luke, I. 31)

(3)  
within thi

t. (4)

be? (7)      *Maria.* Quo modo fiet istud, quia  
                  virum non cognosco? (v.  
syde, (8)      34)

shall light      *Ang.* Spiritus sanctus superveniet.  
                  (v. 35)

(11)  
that is cald

ydn at his      *Mary.* Ecce ancilla Domini. (v.  
                  38)

all this change, a certain fundamental likeness can be made out, it has seemed best to take up the scenes one by one and dispose of each in turn, rather than to attempt a consideration and comparison of the whole group at once.

*Scene 1: The Annunciation.*

The comparison brings out:—

1. The common prophetic prologue.
2. The common fundamental framework. On comparison this fundamental framework is found to follow scripture more closely than the liturgical play in two particulars. The liturgical play contains no expression of fear on Mary's part, followed by the reassuring speech of Gabriel; nor does it contain any reference to Elizabeth. This reference to Elizabeth is in all three of the cyclic plays, as is the reassuring speech of Gabriel. Mary expresses fear in Y and Cov., but not in T. This is probably lost from T; otherwise there would be no reason for Gabriel's reassuring speech. The fact of its presence in Y and Cov., with which T otherwise agrees, would also indicate its former presence in T. These common deviations from Benedictbeuern only emphasize the common fundamental framework of the cyclic scenes.
3. The great similarity in phraseology. This similarity does not extend to the use of common rhymes in the three cycles. It evidently arises from a translation of the liturgical source without extensive enlargement. This liturgical play must have followed scripture even more closely than does Benedictbeuern, since it contains the episode of Mary's fear and the last reference to Elizabeth. In the cycles scripture is followed even more closely than the citations would indicate, as only those parts necessary to bring out the fundamental framework have been quoted. Indeed, it might be thought that the similarity in phraseology arose from the use of the scriptures alone and not from the translation of a liturgical source, did it continue without variation from scripture throughout all the Christmas series. But subsequent scenes, for instance the very next one, contain similarities in phraseology where it is possible to discover no direct scriptural source. The Christmas series must be considered as a whole.

This is one of the plays in which Hohlfeld found T to be a general imitation of Y. We have discovered a general similarity to true Cov. Davidson found this striking similarity in phraseology to run through the so-called Coventry and Chester as well. He thinks it indicates that this scene in all the cycles had the same liturgical source. This is, however, but one scene of a long liturgical play; and, further, the fundamental framework of Chester and the so-called Coventry becomes radically different from this series as the play develops. It is better, therefore, to consider that the similarity here noted arises from a literal use of the biblical source throughout this scene in the different plays from which the cycles developed. That Y, T, and true Cov. have a common source is only to be proved by the discovery that the common fundamental framework extends throughout the group. Davidson stated his conclusion thus:<sup>1</sup> "When agreeing passages are scriptural quotations one cannot base upon them a theory of direct interdependence among extant plays; but must rather consider that they had a common liturgical source." This last clause I would modify by saying: provided the fundamental framework of the groups containing the passages is the same. Otherwise they must be considered to have grown from different liturgical plays each closely following the scriptural source.

As far as this scene in T, Y, and true Cov. is concerned, we find it responding to the test we have set. The three cycles show a common fundamental framework. This is emphasized by a close similarity in phraseology, arising from translation of the original without extensive enlargement.

<sup>1</sup> Davidson, pp. 158-163.

## SCENE 2, THE SALUTATION.

Coventry.

The scene is missing.

York, Pl. 12, sc. 2.

Towneley, Pl. 11.

1. *Mary* entering inquires concerning her relatives.  
Elyzabeth, myn awne cosyne, (19)  
Me thought I coveyte alway mast  
To speke with þe of all my  
kynne,
2. *Elizabeth* welcomes Mary.  
Welcome! mylde Marie,  
Myne aughen cosyne so dere,  
Joifull woman am I,  
þat I nowe see þe here.
3. *Elizabeth*: Blissid be þou anely  
Of all women in feere, etc. (20-  
21).
4. Translation of part of the Magni-  
ficat. (22)
5. They part.

1. *Elizabeth* after welcoming Mary makes this inquiry:  
ffull lang shall I the better be  
That I may speke my fyll with  
the,  
. . . . . (3)  
To wytt how thi freyndys fare  
etc.
2. Towneley had commenced with  
this,  
Welcom, Mary, blyssed blome,  
Ioyfull am I of thi com  
To me, from Nazareth.  
Then follows home news as un-  
der 1.
3. *Elizabeth*: Blyssed be thou of all  
women, etc. (7-8).
4. Translation of Magnificat. (9-  
13).
5. They part.

Benedictbeuern.

ning Mary  
uiry:  
better be,  
  fyll with  
. (3)  
ndys fare,

1. The first of this play is Luke 1,  
       42, 43.  
       Unde hoc mihi, etc.: Ex quo facta  
       est vox salutationes, etc.  
       These verses form part of 3 in  
               Y and T.

need with

l blome,  
om  
reth.  
ws as un-

hou of all  
7-8).

ificat. (9-

3. *Eliz. Benedicta te in mulieribus.*  
       Tuque portabis, etc. (v. 41)
4. *Mary. Magnificat mea, etc.*
5. Deinde recedat Elizabeth.

*Scene 2: The Salutation.*

This scene is lacking in Coventry. In T it follows Joseph's Trouble; in Y it precedes it. As the chronology of Y is correct, the scene is given second. The comparison brings out:—

1. The common fundamental framework of T and Y. This varies markedly from Benedictbeuern in that it discards scripture in the introduction, making this an inquiry after relatives. In Y Mary makes the inquiry and then Elizabeth welcomes her. In T Elizabeth first welcomes Mary and then makes the inquiry. The three remaining episodes are the same in both plays and in the Benedictbeuern.
2. Considerable similar phraseology. In the introduction the welcome of Elizabeth and the inquiry contain very similar phrases, but without the common rhymes which would indicate their transitional origin. The fact that the characters who speak the phrases are different in each cycle is of no importance. These might vary with every editor. The phrasal correspondence in the last three episodes is so like that of the Annunciation that it did not seem necessary to detail it in the comparison.

This fundamental similarity between Y and T would indicate a common source for them. The absence of the scene from Cov. may be accounted for in two ways. Either it never existed and the scene in Y and T is an addition from transitional sources, or it has been dropped by an editor. The latter seems the more reasonable explanation; for, if from a transitional source, the Y and T scenes would have been likely to have had common rhymes as well as similar phrases. Nor would the variation in order in the introduction have been so probable. That in itself indicates a common source more remote than the transitional period. The introduction would have become fixed by translation before it reached T and Y. On the other hand, the text of Cov. which we have is late and has been thoroughly revised by one Robert

Croo (See the finis of the play). The next scene resumes the likeness to T and Y which we found in the preceding Annunciation scene. This is strong evidence that there must have been at one time a similar scene of the Salutation in Coventry. The variation in order between T and Y is doubtless editorial also and arose through the separation of the long liturgical play into shorter plays: Y combining Annunciation and Salutation; T, Annunciation and Joseph's Trouble.

In this Salutation scene Davidson finds the same connection with Chester and so-called Coventry that he found in the scene of the Annunciation. Here the same objections prevail, with the additional one that neither contains the introduction common to T and Y.

So this second scene corresponds to our test in the case of T and Y, with strong probability that a similar scene is lost from Coventry.

### *Scene 3: Joseph's Trouble About Mary.*

This scene is not in Benedictbeuern, nor in any other liturgical and transitional plays which have come down to us. But it shows so many similar characteristics in Y, T, and true Cov. that the comparison enables us to judge with fair accuracy of the common source. The original scene certainly embraced the following events. Joseph greets Mary and reproaches her. She protests her innocence. He is incredulous and says she is deceiving him. Again she protests and he leaves in sorrow and disgust, only to be told by the angel that she spoke the truth. He returns, is forgiven, and they start for Bethlehem. This outline is followed, with greatest exactness by Cov.; an indication that its transitional growth is far from as extensive as that of the other two. The great

SCENE 3, JOSEPH'S TROUBLE ABOUT MARY.

Coventry.

1. Begins (100)  
*Josoff. Mare, my wyff so dere,  
 How doo ye, dame, and whatt  
 chere  
 Ys with you this tyde?*

2. *Mary* replies. *Joseph* continues,  
*Sey, womon; who hath byn here  
 sith I went, (106)  
 To rage wyth thee?*
3. *Mary*. Syr, here was nothur man  
 nor man's eyvin, (108)  
 But only the sond of oure Lorde  
 God in heyvin.

*Jos.* Tell me, womon; whose ys  
 this chyld? (117)

*Mary.* Non but youris, husebond  
 soo myld.

4. *Jos.* Bot myne? allas! allas!  
 why sey ye soo? (120)  
*Wele-away!* womon, now may I  
 goo,  
 Be-gyld as many a-nothur ys.

5. *Mary.* Na, truly, sir, ye be not  
 be-gylde, (123)  
 Nor yet with spott of syn I am  
 not defylde;

6. Joseph here makes a speech ex-  
 pressing his incredulity and de-  
 termination to leave Mary: Now  
 fare-well, Mare, I leyve the here  
 alone, (136)

7. *Ang.* Aryse up, Josoff, and goo  
 whom ageyne (143)  
 Unto Mare, thy wiff, that ys  
 so fre.

Sche hath conseyyid with-owt any  
 trayne (147)

The Seycond Person in Trenete;  
 Jhesu schalbe hys name, sarten,

8. *Jos.* Wherefore to Mare I woll  
 in hast. (155)

*Jos.* Forgeve me, swete wyff,  
 here in this lond! (157)

*Mary.* Now, that Lord in hey-  
 vin, sir, he you forgyve!  
 (164)

And I do for-geve yow in hys  
 name  
 For euermore.

9. *Jos.* But now to Bedlem must I  
 wennde. (168)

Go we to-gedur in Goddis  
 wholle name: (179)

York, Pl. 13.

Begins with account by Joseph of  
 (1-9), his marriage with Mary. But  
 on first meeting her he says:  
*Jos. Gramercy, Marie, saie what  
 chere,  
 Tell me þe soth, how es't with þe?  
 (10)*

Without reply from Mary he goes on.  
*Wha has been there? (10)*  
*Hir sidis shewes she is with childe.  
 Whose ist marie? (11)*  
*Mary. Sir, Goddis and youres. (11).*

*Jos.* Nay, nay, now wate I wele  
 I am begiled. (11). (Joseph,  
 st. 11-21, inquires the truth of  
 two women and tries to get Mary to  
 confess. She replies as above (3),  
 until at last she says,) . . .

*Mary.* Joseph, yhe are begiled, (21)  
 With synne was I neuer filid.

*Jos.* But sitte stille here tille I  
 come agayne, (23)  
 Me bus an errand here beside.  
 (He goes out to sleep.)

*Ang.* Waken, Joseph! and take bet-  
 tir kepe  
 To Marie, þat is þi felawe fest. (25)  
 The childe þat shall be borne of her  
 Itt is consayued of þe haly gast. (27)

Jesus his name þou calle,

*Jos.* Me bus pray hir halde me ex-  
 cused (29)  
 Saie, Marie wiffe, how fares þou?

*Mary.* þe bettir sir, for yhou.  
 (She says she has nothing to for-  
 give.)

*Jos.* Till Bedlem bus me it bere.

Towneley, Pl. 10, st. 15-51.

1. Joseph bemoans his folly in (15-  
 18) his marriage and greeting  
 Mary for the first time says;  
*Hayll, Mary, and well ye be!*  
 (19)

*why, bot woman, what chere  
 with the?*

2. *Mary's* reply is evasive. Joseph  
 says;  
*Who owe this child thou gose  
 with all?*

3. *Mary.* Sir, ye, and god of heuen.  
 (20)

4. *Jos.* That word had thou to  
 tyne, (21)  
 ffor it is right full fare me fro,  
 (22)

And I forthynkys thou has done  
 so

Thise ill dedys bedene; etc.

5. *Mary.* At godys wyll, Joseph,  
 (23), must it be  
 ffor certanly bot god and ye  
 I know none other man;

ffor fleshly was I never fylid.

6. *Joseph* in an aside (25-42), re-  
 lates the story of his marriage  
 as in the beginning of Y (Apoc-  
 rypya), and says at the end;  
 To wylderness I will for thi

Enfors me for to fare;

And neuer longer with hir dele,

But stilly shall I from hir stèle,

That mete shall we no more.

7. *Ang.* Turne home to thi spouse  
 agane, (44)

Look thou deme in hir no trane,  
 ffor she was neuer ffylde.

· · · · ·

She hase consayued the holy gast,  
 And she shall bere godys son;

8. *Jos.* ffor thy to hir now Wyll I  
 weynde', (47)

*Jos.* A, mary, wyfe, what chere?  
 (48)

*Mary.* The better, sir, that ye ar  
 here; (49)

*Jos.* fforgyf me, I the pray.

*Mary.* Now all that euer ye  
 sayde me to,  
 God forgyf you, and I do,  
 With all the myght I  
 may.

9. Not in T.

addition in T and Y is the story of Joseph's marriage; but it is an independent addition in each, for it occurs at different places and is developed in different ways. In Y the *puellae* who first meet the returning Joseph are characters in the play. In T they are only referred to by Joseph in the course of his story. The points brought out by the comparison between the cycles are:—

1. The almost identical words with which Joseph first addresses Mary in each cycle.
2. His request to know whose the child is.
3. Mary's reply. This has been elaborated in Cov., but the stanza brings out the same meaning as in Y and T.
4. The common reply of Joseph, "I am beguiled," varied in T.
5. Mary's reply. "Ye are not beguiled. With synne was I never fylde." The common rhyme in Coventry and York is noteworthy. But Y has distorted the sense. In T the rhyme is missing.
6. Joseph takes leave of Mary.
7. The speech of the angel.
8. Joseph begs Mary's forgiveness. Note that Cov. and T agree in Joseph's first speech given in the comparison; that Y and T agree in Mary's reply; and that Cov. and T agree in the forgiveness by Mary.
9. Cov. and Y make the two start for Bethlehem.

I have indicated in 8 above how two of the cycles agree while one varies; and that it is not always the same two which agree. Other instances occur in the play:—

1. In Cov. and T Mary replies to Joseph's first greeting. Not so in Y.
2. In Y and T Mary's defence is the same, "Sir ye and god." This is more elaborate in Cov.
3. The doubt of Joseph, "I am beguiled," expressed similarly in Y and Cov., is different in T.
4. Rhyme, *begylde, defyled*, in Cov. and Y. Not in T.

If it had been found that the same two were always similar and the same one always different, it would have

been possible to say nothing but that the varying one had a different source. When, however, we find the variations running Y, Cov., T, T, Y, Cov., Y, T, and that some of the differences even here, as in 2 above, are only a matter of elaboration, the result is to add to the argument for a common source with individual variations. The similarity is fundamental; the dissimilarity, editorial.

The rhyme in Cov. and Y, noted above, would seem in itself to indicate a direct borrowing of one by the other. But I am not certain that an isolated example of that kind should be considered, especially when T does not contain the rhyme, though evidently from the same source, and when the meaning of the corresponding phrases differs in the two.

In Chester this scene has never been expanded beyond a single speech by Joseph and the angel's reply. So-called Coventry is very similar to T, Y, and true Coventry, and suggests a borrowing from an older form of those cycles and, afterwards, a separate enlargement.

So-called Coventry, p. 117, lines 22-23:—<sup>1</sup>

*Jos.* How hast thou ferde, jentyl mayde,  
Whyl I have be out of londe?

p. 118, line 19:

- Jos.* Sey me, Mary, this childds fadyr ho is?  
 12. *Mary.* The fadyr of hevyn and þe it is,  
 16.       This childe is Goddys and þour.  
 17. *Jos.* Goddys childe! thou lyist, in fay;  
 21. *Jos.* But þit I sey, Mary, whoos childe is this?  
 22. *Mary.* Goddys and þoure, I sey i-wis.

Also p. 118, line 23:—

*Jos.* þa! þa! alle olde men to me take tent,

<sup>1</sup> The text of so-called Coventry is Halliwell, *Ludus Coventriae*.

#### SCENE 4, THE BIRTH OF CHRIST.

Coventry:—

1. *Mary*. God haue marcy, Josoſſe, my ſpouſe ſoo dere; (184)  
All profetts herto dothe beyre wyttnes,  
The were tyme now draith nere  
That my chyld wolbe borne,  
wyche ys Kyng of bliſſe.
2. *Jos.* Loo! blesſid Mare, here ſchall ye lend, (192)
3. *Joseph* (194-203) goes for help. Compare Chester, p. 109. (This seems to be a late change. Originally he must have gone for fuel as in Y; for he brings no help, and the last scene is like Y.)  
The child is born.  
(Here a shepherd scene intervenes.) 204-277.
4. *Joseph* entering worships. (284)  
Now welcum to me, the Makar of mon,  
With all the omage thatt I con;
5. *Joseph* takes the child in his arms to warm it. When Mary asks it back he says;  
That ſchalbe done anon, Mare ſo myld, (295)  
For the brethyng of these bestis hath warmyd (hym) well, i-wys.

York, Pl. 14:—

- Mary*. God will vs wiſſe, full wele witt þe, þer-fore, Joseph, be of gud chere, For in this place borne will he be þat ſall vs ſauē fro ſorowes ſere, boþe euen and morne. (5)  
Sir, witte þe wele þe tyme is nere,  
hee will be borne.  
*Jos.* þan behoves vs bide here ſtille, here in þis ſame place all þis nyght.  
*Joseph* goes out after fuel. (7-12). The child is born. *Mary* worships and *Joseph*, outside, complains of the cold.

*Joseph* entering worships.  
Nowe welcomē, floure faireſt of hewe,  
I ſhall þe menske with mayne and myght.

They put the child in the man- ger and ſay the beaſts worſhip him. (17-19)  
*Mary*. To halde hym warme þei are full fayne (19) with bare warme breth, *Joseph* and *Mary* worſhip.

Compare this last with true Cov., 65, 13:—

*Jos.* All olde men, insampull take be me!

As so-called Coventry does not contain the story of Joseph's marriage, it must have been borrowed, either from the true Coventry or else from another play, before this story was added. It makes more evident the fact that the story is a late addition to the play. I have already shown that the differing treatment of the *Puellae* incident would indicate different editors in T and Y; that one was independent of the other as far as this addition was concerned.

This discussion has developed the fact that here also the scenes in the three cycles respond to the test we have set. There was developed in the discussion a common fundamental framework or basis upon which many additions and variations have been made. The plan of this framework is indicated by certain similar phrases without any common rhymes except in one instance. Even here the common rhyme is probably accidental, as it is found in only two of the three cycles, and there with a distorted meaning in one.

In this scene the construction of the Chester cycle begins to differ from Y, T, and true Cov., and the agreement on the part of so-called Cov. is evidently a late borrowing.

#### Scene 4: The Birth of Christ.

The scene of Christ's birth is missing from T, its place being taken by the first of the Wakefield Shepherd Plays. This omission is probably due to editing. The superior interest of the W plays has led to the insertion of both and the crowding out of the birth. A similar condition

of affairs exists in the Passion Group. In T the second trial before Pilate follows directly after the trial before Caiaphas. In Y three scenes, The Dream of Pilate's Wife, Jesus before Pilate, Trial before Herod, intervene between Caiaphas and Pilate II. The trial before Caiaphas in T and the first scene of the Second Trial before Pilate are in the meter peculiar to the Wakefield plays. This is evidently another place where the superior interest of these W scenes has crowded out other less interesting matter. In Coventry and Y there is much confusion in the birth scenes, but even here the general plan of the original can be traced. On page 431 it was noted that the Shepherd and Birth scenes in Cov. were confused; each divided into two scenes, the birth alternating with the Shepherds. In the other cycles, where each scene is a play by itself, this would be impossible. If however, we consider the two birth scenes and the two shepherd scenes in Cov. together, in relation to the Shepherd and Birth plays in the other cycles, their fundamental similarity becomes apparent. Benedictbeuern covers the scene with a rubric: "Deinde Maria vadet in lectum suum quae iam de spiritu sancto concepit, et pariat filium. Cui assideat Joseph in habitu honesto et prolixa barba: Nato puero, appareat stella et incipiat Chorus hanc antiphonarum. 'Hodie Christus Natus est.' " Then follows the *Stella* proper.

The points of correspondence between York and Cov. are obvious:—

1. Mary gives her reason for desiring to stop.
2. Joseph says they will stop where they are.
3. Joseph goes out.
4. The babe is born.
5. Joseph comes in and worships.
6. The incident of the warming by the breath of the cattle.

It must be noticed, however, that when Joseph goes out, he does not go for the same purpose in both plays: in Cov. it is to get help; in Y, to get fuel for a fire. In the comparison, the probability that Cov. originally agreed with Y is noted, and the scene is compared with the same in Chester. There Joseph goes out for help and brings back two midwives. Here he goes out for help and brings back none. There is no further reference to bringing help in the play. But there is reference to the cold in the last scene, when Joseph has returned. On the other hand, in Y there is no reference to midwives; but the cold is made a motive, leading to the tender scene where the cattle, warming the baby with their breath, are said to worship him. It is also referred to by Joseph when without. There he complains of the bitter cold. This, it seems to me, must have been the original motive in Cov. as well. In that last scene, it is true that in Cov. the babe is held in Joseph's arms, while in York it is put into the manger. But there is a hint in Cov. that there also the child was originally in the manger. After the quotation from Coventry given as 5 in the comparison, Joseph says:—

*Josoff.* Now, in my narmys I schall hym fold,  
 Kyng of all kyngis be fyld and be fyrth;  
 He myght haue had bettur, and himselfe wold,  
 Than the breythyng of these bestis to warme hym with.

This might be taken to indicate that Joseph lifted the babe from the manger. The basis of the scene is evidently the same as in Y.

I take it, then, that in this instance Y is in many particulars closer to the original source than Coventry, which shows evidence of editing, at least in the particular of Joseph's departure to seek help. The fundamental like-

ness between the two scenes is further illustrated by the similar, though not identical, phraseology of sections 1, 2, 4, 5 in the comparison. Chester and the so-called Cov. have quite a different development.

*Scene 5: The Shepherds.*

This scene appears in each cycle: in T twice, with different development in each case. I use for comparison the Fleury Magi noted above and the first, the simpler, of the T plays. The Fleury play is evidently not the basis of the cyclic play; in fact, it can be taken as nothing more than an illustration of a liturgical Shepherd for comparison with the others. It introduces Herod at the first because the Stella is simply a scene of the Magi, in which Herod figures. In 2 of Fleury, the Shepherds show amazement as in the cycles, but in 4 is introduced a scene with the Obstetrics, not in the cycles. Nor is the close the same.

Of the cyclic plays, we know that T is a late play in its present form, since it is by the W editor. He has made the play appear, at first sight, very different from the others by the interest he has shown in developing the first scenes where the shepherds feast; but there are various things which indicate that the whole was written on the basis of an older play similar to York and Cov. It is of interest here, as formerly, to note the variations brought out by the comparisons:—

1. In 1 of the comparison, T and Cov. agree. Y differs.
2. In 2 Cov. and Y, as the quotations indicate, agree. T differs.
3. In 4 all agree; but Y and T more closely than Cov.
4. In 5 Cov. and T agree. Y differs.

Here we have the same phenomenon witnessed before.

## SCENE 5, THE SHEPHERDS.

Coventry.

1. One shepherd complaining of the cold and the loss of his sheep is met by two others. They sit down to eat. (204-241)  
*Here awhyle lett vs rest,  
 And repast owrself of the best;  
 Tyll thatt the sun ryse in the est  
 Let vs all here abyde.* (238-241)

2. A star appears in the sky.  
*Shep. Asse long ase eyuer I haue  
 wachid my fold,  
 Yett sawe I neyuer soche a slyght  
 In fyld.* (244-246)  
 (Here the prophets are quoted.)

3. The angels having sung the Gloria, the Shepherds start to seek the baby. (Here birth scene intervenes.)  
 The angels, telling them not to fear, say; (297-302)  
*Hyrd-men hynd,  
 Drede ye nothyng  
 Off thys star thatt ye do se;  
 For thys same morne  
 Godis Sun ys borne  
 In Bedlem of a meydin fre.*

4. The shepherds worship, giving simple gifts. (307-324)

5. *Mary.* Now, herdmen hynd, (325)  
 For youre comyng  
 To my chylde schall I prae,  
 Asse he ys heyvin kyng,  
 To grant you his blesyng,  
 And to hys blys that ye may  
 wynd  
 At your last day.

York, Pl. 15.

A shepherd quotes the prophets.  
 Then all hasten to find their flocks,  
 but are stopped by

A vision in the sky.  
 Als lange as we haue herde-men bene,  
 And kepis þe catell in þis cloghe,  
 So selcouth a sight was neuere non  
 sene. (6)

The Angels appearing sing and while conversing about the prophecy (9) a shepherd repeats their song.  
 An aungell brought vs tythandes  
 newe,  
 A babe in Bedlem shulde be borne,

Following a star,  
 þone sterne to þat lorde sall vs lede.  
 (10)  
 They worship, offering simple gifts.

Towneley, Pl. 12.

1. The first shepherd comes on complaining of his ill luck. Two other shepherds with their bells meet him and they feast. (A this is elaborated at such length that it forms the most of the play.)
2. Having eaten they sleep and are awakened by the angels' song
3. which began  
*herkyn, hyrdes, awake! /  
 gyf louyng ye shall,* (34)  
*he is borne for(y)oure sake,/*  
*lorde perpetual, etc.*
4. Following a star;  
 (Here the prophecies come in.)  
 It commys on a rase/  
 yon sterne vs to. (51)  
 They worship, giving simple gif
5. *Mary.* he that all myghtys ma  
 the makere of heuen, (5)  
 That is for to say/  
 my son that I neuen,  
 Reward you this day/  
 As he sett all on seue  
 etc.

Fleury Magi.

nes on com-  
luck. Two  
their boy  
feast. (All  
such length  
lost of the

Parato Herode et ceteris personis,  
tunc quidam

sep and are  
gels' song

angelus cum multitudine in excelsis  
apparet; Quo viso,, Pastores per-  
territi

!/  
l, (34)  
re sake,/’  
c.

salutem annuntiet eis (angelus) de  
ceteris adhuc tacentibus. “Nolite  
timere vos, ecce enim euangelizo vo-  
bis gaudium magnum quod erit omni  
populo, quia natus hodie salvator  
num de,” etc. . . . Et subito *omnis  
multitudinis* cum angelo dicat: “Glo-  
ria in excelsis, etc.”

come in.)  
'  
(51)  
simple gifts.  
ghtys may/  
heuen, (55)

*Past.* Transeamus usque Bethleem.  
(Scene with “duae Mulieres custo-  
dentes praesep.”)  
Tunc Pastores procidentes adorent  
infantem.

I neuen,  
y/  
l on seuen;

The variations are not confined to one cycle, but run Y, T, Cov., Y. The agreement of T, when we know it is an editor's work, is remarkable and can be accounted for only in the way I have indicated; namely, that he must have re-written an older play, enlarging it in the special shepherd scene. That he did the same with play 13, using the same basis, is evident on analysis:—

1. The first shepherd comes on complaining. The others meet him and the Mak episode takes place. This part of the play is very elaborate, extending through the first seventy stanzas.

2. Having punished Mak, the shepherds rest. St. 71.
3. Bidden to rise by the Angel's song,

Ryse, hyrd men heynd!/ for now is he borne (72)  
That shall take fro the feynd/ that adam had lorne:

4. Following a star (here the prophecies come in),

That betokyns yond starne. (73)  
let vs seke hym there,

they worship, giving simple gifts.

5. *Mary.* he (Jesus) kepe you fro wo!  
I shall pray hym so;  
Tell furth as ye go,  
And myn on this morne.

There is one variation common to all the cycles, but not occurring in the same place in each: a number of quotations are introduced from the prophets. In Y these are at the beginning; in Cov., when the shepherds see the star in the sky; and in both of T, on the way to Bethlehem. Whether this is a variation which has crept into each play separately, or a scene common to all independently shifted in each, I am not able to say. The general order of the original is apparent. The play opened with

the meeting of the shepherds and their sitting down to feast and then to sleep. Then the angel host appeared and the shepherds were terrified. Again the angels appeared, singing the *Gloria*, and spoke the "Noli timere" (See Fleury Magi). At this the shepherds went to Bethlehem, following a star, and worshipped. On their leaving, Mary blessed them. On this scheme the variations have been grafted. York deleted the feast of the shepherds and put the prophecies there. T developed the feast into an elaborate farce in each play. Confusion crept in between the appearance of the angel and that of the star (See Cov. and Y). And the prophecy was inserted in Cov. and T wherever it seemed to fit the best.

Similarity in phraseology, while not extensive, serves to mark the plan of the framework; and from this it appears that the T plays are a re-writing of the older transitional form by the W man.

#### *Scene 6: The Magi.*

In the comparison of this scene the liturgical Magi used is that of Fleury, only parts of which are taken, as it differs from the cyclic play in certain particulars. First, the presence of the shepherd scene, as a scene in the Magi itself, causes the omission of Herod's vaunting speeches at the beginning and gives the opportunity for the Magi to meet the shepherds on their way back from Bethlehem to their flocks. Another incident peculiar to the Magi is the introduction of the obstetrics. Otherwise the Fleury play is very similar to the cyclic plays, although when Herod talks to the Magi a speech by his son is introduced. But the lack of resemblance in the Fleury play only emphasizes the resemblance between the cyclic plays. In this particular scene, however, only resemblance in

SCENE 6, THE MAGI.

Coventry

- Herod vaunts; orders Messenger to proclaim a tax of five marks on all foreigners. (475-528)

- The three kings meet and after much discourse concerning the star, ride on together. (Pl. 17)

- Herod and Messenger advance. Mess. Hayle, lorde, most off myght! (603)  
And announces arrival of kings.

- Herod orders Mess. to bring the kings before him. (613 ff.)

- Messenger gives Herod's commands to the Kings.

- Herod salutes kings and inquires their reasons for the journey. In dismissal he orders them to return to him. (643 ff.)

- The Magi miss the star and kneel to pray for its return. Their prayer is answered.

Yondur, brothur, I see the star,  
Where-by I kno he ys nott far;  
Therefore, lordis, goo we nar  
Into this pore place. (698)

- The three kings make their offerings in turn and receive Mary's blessing. (699-716) (22-25)

- The three kings decide, because of weariness, to sleep before returning to Herod. (722) (26)

- They are warned by an angel to return home another way. This they do. (725 ff) (27-28)

York, Pl. 16, 17.

Herod vaunts; orders Messenger to go through the land and hale to him all disbelievers in "Mahowne." (Pl. 16)

Herod and Messenger. (Pl. 17)

Herod and Messenger.  
Mess. Mi lorde ser Herowde! Kyng  
with croune! (7)  
And announces arrival of the kings.  
(8)

Omitted in Y. See above.

Omitted in Y. See above.

As in Cov. In addition the kings quote prophets.

A! siris! I se it stande  
A-boven where he is borne, (19)  
Lo! here is þe house at hande,  
We haue noȝte myste þis morne.

Towneley.

- Herod vaunting orders his soldiers to arrest all striving against law and order.

- The three kings meet and after much discourse concerning the star ride on together.

- Herod and Messenger.  
Mess. Mahowne, that is of grea pausty, (44)  
My lorde, sir herode, the sa and se!  
And announces the coming kings.

- Herod orders kings brought before him. (55-56)

- Messenger gives Herod's commands to the kings. (57-59)

- As in York; but councillors quote prophets.

- The Magi miss the star and kneel to pray for its return. The prayer is answered.

Yond is the place that we ha soght (89)  
ffrom far cuntre;  
yond is the chyld that all ha wroght,  
Behold and se!

- The three kings make their offerings in turn and receive Mary's blessing. (90-96)

- The three kings decide because of weariness, to sleep. (97-99)

- They are warned by an angel to return home another way. This they do. (100-106)

	Fleury Magi (In parts)
rs his sol- ving against	Pastores precedes this scene.
t and after erning the	The Magi meet and greet each other. Then: Eamus ergo et inquiramus eum, etc.
is of greatt	Quibus visis, Herodes mittet ad eos Armigerum. He inquires who they may be as do interpreters.
, the saue	
coming of	
brought be- 5-56)	Herodes mittens Armigerum pro magis.
rod's com- (57-59)	<i>Arm.</i> Regia vos mandata vocant, non segnitur ite.
illors quote	Agrees in general with T. Herod talks with kings; consults scribes and rages. His son speaks. He or- ders kings to return to him.
r and kneel urn. Their	<i>Magi.</i> Ecce stella in Oriente praevia, etc. (Here shepherds and Magi meet.)
it we haue	
at all has	
e their of- eive Mary's	Admitted by obstetrics the Magi make their offerings.
de because (97-99)	Istis factis, Magi incipiatur dormire ubi ante praeseppe.
in angel to way. This	donec angelus moneat in somnis ut redeant in regionem suam per aliam viam, dicans, etc.

general development is found. In the ten divisions of the comparison only two, 3 and 7, show similarity of phrase, and these are not so close as in some other scenes. But the similarity in structure is marked, and here, as in the preceding cases where there is variation in any division, the variation exists only in one cycle. Nor are the variations in every case in the same cycle. In division one, where there is an apparent difference between the three, it is only apparent. Each editor has developed in his own way Herod's demand that the messenger go out and discover all who are disaffected toward him. The general meaning is the same in each case. In 4 and 5 Cov. and T agree, Y differs. The difference in 5 is a logical development of that in 4. In 6 Y and T agree in having quotations from the prophets which are not in Cov. In Y the Kings, and in T the Councillors quote the prophets; but variations in actors, to whom lines are assigned, are not of value enough to be noticed, since they may easily be changed at the whim of an editor. In every other respect the plays agree in their development in the three cycles.

This is the second of the plays in which Hohlfeld thought he had discovered a certain number of parallel passages in T and Y, as well as a "general imitation." But the parallelism in this play seems to be either purely accidental or else the result of late borrowing. St. 100 of the T play is without doubt a direct quotation of Y, pl. 17, st. 27. But such a direct quotation must be a very much later addition to the cycle than any similar passages that might have come down by way of translation from liturgical times. It presupposes full development in the Y play before quotation is possible; and full development means growth into the Final Period. It seems best, therefore, to consider this to be a borrowing made

at the time of the other direct borrowings from Y. It contains the Angel's warning to the sleeping Magi, and might easily have been inserted in place of a similar T stanza.

Another passage which Hohlfeld considers decidedly similar to Y is that in which Balaam's prophecy is cited.<sup>1</sup> It probably arose through separate use of the same scripture by the T and Y editors, as it occurs in T in the conversation the Magi have at their meeting, but in Y at the point in the conversation with Herod where the kings quote the prophets to him. The similarity is marked, but not more extensive than would arise from the use of common scripture by different editors. T. (st. 35) runs:—

Certan, balaam spekys of this thyng,  
 That of Iacob a starne shall spryng  
 That shall overcome kasar and kyng,  
 Withoutten stryfe;  
 All folk shalbe to hym obeyng  
 That berys the lyfe.

Y is as follows (pl. 17, st. 14):—

Sir, the thar meruayle no-thing,  
 Of þis ilke nott þat þus-gate newes,  
 For Balaam saide a starne shulde spring  
 Of Jacob kynde, and þat is Jewes.

The scripture is Numbers xxiv, 17: "There shall come forth a star out of Jacob," etc. These must be considered simply independent quotations of the same prophecy.

A second similarity Hohlfeld thinks to exist in the exclamation of Herod, Y, st. 11: "Kyng! in þe dewyl way, dogges, Fy!"; and T, 49: "we fy! fy! dewyls on thame all thre!"; or 48: "King! the dewill! bot of what em-

<sup>1</sup> *Anglia* xi, p. 293.

SCENE 7. THE FLIGHT INTO EGYPT.<sup>1</sup>

York, Pl. 18.

- line.  
 37. Wakyn, Joseph! and take entente!  
 40. þar-fore I bidde þe slepe no mare.  
 41. A! myghtfull lorde, whateuere that mente?  
 42. So swete a voyce herde I neuer ayre.  
 51. For I am sente to þe,  
 52. Gabriell, goddis aungell bright,  
 55. For Horowde the kyng gars do to dede  
 56. All knave childer  
 58. with þeris twa  
 59. þat are of olde.  
 62. Tille I witte the for to saie.  
 84. Marie, my daughter dere,  
 86. A! leue Joseph, what chere?  
 105. I durk, I dare,  
 106. Whoo may my care  
 107. Of balis blynne?  
 139-41. His harte aught to be ful sare,  
     On slike a foode hym to for-fare,  
     þat nevir did ill.  
 160. Do tyte, pakke same oure gere,  
 206. Allas! Joseph for woo,  
 208. Was neuer wight in worde so will!  
 193. Joseph, full woo is me,  
 229. Fare wele and haue gud day!

Towneley, Pl. 15.

- line.  
 1. Awake, Ioseph, and take inent!  
 2. Thou ryse, and slepe nomare!  
 11. A! myghtfull god,  
 12. what euer this ment,  
 13. So swete of toyn?  
 5. I am an angell to the sent,  
 14. it is I, an angell sent to the.  
 21. ffor herode dos to dy  
 22. All knaue chyldren . . .  
 23. within two yere that be of eld  
 30. tyll I wyll the at say.  
 55. Mary, my darlyng dere,  
 57. A! leyf Joseph, what chere?  
 83. I lurk and dare!  
 80. Who may my doyllys dyll?  
 86-88. his hart shuld be full sare  
     Sichon foroto fare  
     That neuer yit did yll.  
 121. bot tytt pak vp oure gere.  
 131. Alas! I am full wo!  
 132. was neuer wyght so wyll!  
 157. Alas, full wo is me!  
 181. And haue now all good day!

Coventry.

- Angellus.* (818-829)  
 Mare and Josoff, to you I sey,  
     Swete word from the Fathur  
         bryng you full ryght:  
 Owt of Bedlem in-to Eygype forth g  
         ye the wey  
     And with you take the King, fu  
         of myght,  
     For drede of Eroddis rede!  
*Josoff.* A-ryse up, Mare, hasten  
     and sone;  
 Owre Lordis wyll nedys mvst b  
         done,  
     Lyke ase the angell vs bad.  
*Mare.* Mekely, Josoff, my non  
     spouse,  
     Towarde that cuntrey let vs re  
         peyre;  
 Att Eygyp to sum cun off howse,  
     God grant hus grace saff to cu  
         there!

<sup>1</sup> Comparison of Y and T from O. Herttrich, *Studien zu den York Plays*.

**Freising.**

sey,  
Fathur I  
ght:  
e forth goo

King, full  
iis rede!  
e, hastily  
's mvst be  
s bad.  
my none  
let vs rey-

howse,  
aff to cum

*Ang.* Joseph, Joseph surge; Joseph  
in Aegyptum cum matre feras eito  
Christum.  
Ne cum mactandis pueris rex mactet  
et ipsum  
Admonitus redeas ubi nex fraus rex-  
que quiescit.  
*Joseph.* Angelus a patria nos prae-  
cipe ire, maria;  
Rex fugiendi erit, Puerum qui per-  
dere quaerit.

*Maria.* Omnia dura pati vitando  
pericula nati  
Mater sum praesto; jam vidam tu  
comes esto.  
*Jos.* pergans in Aegyptum.

pyre!" But this can only have been an accidental similarity in curses.

It must be considered, then, that in this play in the three cycles we have a fundamental similarity in framework. This has made it easy for the York editor of T to replace an older T stanza by the corresponding one from York.

### *Scene 7: The Flight into Egypt.*

The Flight into Egypt is the third and last scene in which Hohlfeld notes a borrowing of isolated phrases along with a general imitation of Y by T. So marked is this similarity in phrase that I have quoted my comparison of Y and T from Hohlfeld's authority, O. Hertrich, *Studien zu den York Plays*. It is at once apparent that the similar phrases are much more numerous than would be the case if they were simply tags or catchwords remaining from the liturgical episodes, such as have been discovered in other scenes. Furthermore, a number of these phrases contain rhymes common to the two cycles. There are at least four of these: Y, *entent, nomare*; T, *intent, nomare*; Y, *dere, chere*; T, *dere, chere*; Y, *sare, fare, yll*; T, *sare, fare, yll*; Y, *woo, wyll*; T, *wo, wyll*. On page 426 attention was called to the fact that the presence of common rhymes in any number would make possible only one conclusion: the plays containing these rhymes must have been taken from a common source already translated into English, that is, already transitional in nature. This must be the conclusion here.

It is no surprise, then, to find Cov. entirely different from Y and T. The comparison contains the whole scene, which is an episode in the long scene of the Innocents, after the soldiers have been sent to Bethlehem and just

before the slaughter. This is the position of the scene in the play from Freising, quoted as the liturgical example, where it is very similar to Coventry. The only possible conclusion is that in Cov. we have the play in almost its liturgical form, while T and Y have inserted another more elaborate scene. This was transitional in its nature. When the insertion took place cannot be told. It may have caused the change in the position of the scene, making it a separate play before the Innocents, as a scene of such length could not easily have been incorporated into that play. Evidently neither Y borrowed from T, nor T from Y, since the characters are differently developed in the two. In Y Joseph is all sympathy and patience with Mary. His fault-finding in T is in sad contrast to this. He there says (T, st. 12):—

So wyll a wyght as I,  
In warld was neuer man;  
howsehold and husbandry  
ffullsole I may it ban;  
That bargain dere I by.  
yong men, bewar, red I;  
wedyng makys me all wan.

This diverse development could easily have taken place after the time when a common transitional source had been used; and does not make it necessary to consider that there was any contrast between Y and T during that period. It might, on the other hand, be thought, as Hohlfeld, indeed, does think,<sup>1</sup> that this similarity between Y and T arises from the fact that the T editor wrote the play from his remembrance of Y, incorporating such phrases as he could. But this has not been found to be the case in other plays, notably 10 and 14, in which

<sup>1</sup> *Anglia*, xi, 293, 307.

**SCENE 8, THE INNOCENTS.**

Coventry.

1. Messenger announces departure of Magi. (768-776)
2. Herod orders children killed. (786-792)
3. (After the Flight, 816-829). Women enter; knights kill children; women lament. (830-883)
4. The knights report to Herod who is angry because Christ has escaped. (884-900)

York, Pl. 19.

- Herod, amidst his vaunting, learns that the Magi have returned another way. (1-17)
- The same. (18-24)
- Knights kill children; women lament. (24-30)
- (31-35)

Towneley.

1. Same as Y. (1-22)
2. The same as Y. (22-36)
3. The same as Y. (37-45)
4. The knights report to Herod who rejoices thinking Jesus must certainly have been killed. (47-51)

Fleury Magi. (In part.)

After the Flight Mess. says to Herod:  
Rex in aeternum vive! Delusus es,  
Domine; Magi per viam redierunt  
alium.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 2-36)  | <i>Herod:</i> Armiger limine, pueros, fac<br>ense perire.                                 |
| 7-45)  | <i>Matres:</i> Oremus, tuae, natorum par-<br>cite vitae.                                  |
| Herod who<br>is must cer-<br>tified. (47-57) | Follows the model illustrated by the<br>Chester plays which differ from T,<br>Y, and Cov. |

he has supposed the same conditions to exist. Why, then, should it be more probable in this? Some color is lent to the contention, however, by the fact that st. 11 of play 1 may possibly be a memory of York. But st. 11 is in couplets, and there is no evidence that the couplet editor worked on the T play of the Flight. In fact, the meter is regular throughout. We must, then, consider the Flight in Y and T to have been derived from the same transitional source, and that Cov. alone shows the original form of the scene. The place from which this transitional source of Y and T was obtained cannot be stated.

#### *Scene 8: The Innocents.*

This is the last scene in the Coventry Shearmen and Tailors. The relationship between the three cycles, broken in the last play, is here resumed, though there are no corresponding phrases. I again compare with the Fleury Magi. This lack of correspondence in phrase is explained, as far as T is concerned, by the fact that the T play is the work of the W editor. Hohlfeld thinks<sup>1</sup> it one of those plays which are founded on a memory of York but contain no phrases common to both cycles. But we have already seen how in the two shepherd plays the W editor rewrote old plays. That this play is doubtless an instance of the same thing, the comparison reveals. Here, however, his work seems to have been more balanced and not confined so largely to the development of a single episode. There is only one variation from the regular outline, and that in the work of the W editor in the final episode where the knights report. The other two cycles agree and show the original purport of the scene.

<sup>1</sup> *Anglia*, xi, pp. 293, 307.

We have now considered all the scenes in the Christmas series to the close of those plays which, on the authority of Chambers, might have had a liturgical source. A striking correspondence in fundamental framework has developed. There remain two plays, the Purification and the Doctors, which are connected more closely with the Nativity than with any other episode in Christ's life and would naturally be closing scenes in a Christmas play. That this was the case is probable, though the evidence is not so clear as in the plays already considered. There the fact that all the scenes are found in a single Cov. play is evidence that all are to be grouped under one head; of which grouping additional evidence is brought out by the fact that we have other plays in Latin, and therefore liturgical, of about the same content. None of these plays also contains the episode of the Purification and the Doctors. Cov., it is true, has them both, but in a separate play, the Weavers' play. There are about this play, however, some things which suggest that it might have split off from the Shearmen and Tailors. One is the peculiar development which the prophetic prologue has received in Cov. Before the Magi scene a dialogue of prophets is inserted, which recounts preceding events and thus becomes a modified prophetic prologue to the scene. At this point there would otherwise have been an abrupt transition in scene from the manger in Bethlehem to Herod's palace. At such a place a break in the play might naturally occur. Turning now to the Weavers' play, we find it introduced by an exactly similar prophetic prologue. As the prologue to the Magi in Shearmen and Tailors rehearsed the story of Christ's birth and the coming of the shepherds, which were the events recorded in the preceding scenes, so the prologue to the Weavers' play rehearses the coming of the kings who followed a mys-

terious star; this all as an introduction to the story of Mary's Purification and of the Doctors. Here, then, the break in the play has evidently occurred. The Purification shows signs of considerable enlargement in Cov., and this may have been the cause of the break. It might be said in opposition to this view that the prophetic introduction to the Magi marks the beginning of a play originally separate from the Birth and Shepherds, which has later been joined to it; but it must be remembered that the tendency, as the plays grew, was for scenes to break off and form separate plays, that the single play embracing all the scenes on Christ's nativity is the earlier form. In this connection it is noteworthy that the prologue to the Weavers' play only rehearses the coming of the Magi and not all of the preceding scenes, as though it deliberately refrained from repeating the preceding prologue. This would indicate an originally organic connection. We must, then, hold the theory that originally all these plays were one and that they furnished two points of cleavage where *prophetae* had been inserted as dialogued introductions to the Magi and Purification. At only one of these points had cleavage actually taken place; that is, between the Magi and Purification. If we consider that the T and Y cycles developed from the same source as Cov., that would account for the position of the Purification after the Innocents and before the Doctors in T. In the Y text it has been misplaced, but in Burton's list<sup>1</sup> of Y (1415) it is in the same position as in T. This we may conclude to have been its original position. If now a comparison is made of the two plays in the three cycles, the Purification will be found to contain the same fundamental relationships which we have

<sup>1</sup> Miss L. T. Smith, *York Plays*, Introd., xxi, and note.

found in the other plays of the group, while the Doctors presents certain new characteristics in that it is in both instances a late borrowing from Y; from which both have in most places borrowed word for word. There is no liturgical nor transitional play extant with which to compare the cyclic play.

*Scene 9: The Purification of Mary (T 17, Y 41).*

Unfortunately the T play is a fragment, two leaves of the ms. being lost. Compared, as far as it goes, with Y, it shows the following scenes:—

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| Y. 1. Simeon and Anna proph-<br>esy.   | T. 1. Not in T.   |
| 2. Simeon bemoans his age<br>but calls to mind the<br>prophets and prays for<br>life until he can see the<br>Christ. The angels prom-<br>ise this. He praises God. | 2. Same as Y. At the close<br>Simeon hears the bells<br>calling him to the<br>temple. |
| 3. Mary and Joseph pre-<br>pare to go to the temple<br>for the Purification.   | 3. Same as in Y, but much<br>shorter.   |
| 4. Joseph and Mary offer<br>doves. Anna welcomes<br>the babe.  | 4. Not in T.  |
| 5. Angel summons Simeon<br>to the temple.  | 5. Angels summon Simeon<br>to the temple. T breaks<br>off.                            |

With the exception of the scenes with Anna, which T does not contain, the two plays have practically the same development, though there is no correspondence in phraseology. The Cov. play<sup>1</sup> is much longer and more complex than either of these, but on analysis shows striking similarities to them.

<sup>1</sup> *Anglia*, xxv, 212.

Cov., Sc. 1, 1-174. A long *prophetæ* rehearsing events of the Magi.  
 Sc. 2, 175-287. Speech by Simeon in which he calls prophets to witness that Christ will be born and prays to see that babe. A scene between Simeon and Anna seems to have been inserted into the original scene here. At line 202, after recounting the prophecies, Simeon begins his prayer that he may see the babe before he dies; ending it,

Yett, lorde, þi grace to me now extende!

Suffur me rathur yett to lyve in peyne,

Then to dy, or thatt I thatt solam syght haue seyne!

This corresponds to the last stanza of Simeon's prayer in T.

T, st. 9. Bot, lord, that vs thy grace has hight,

Send me thy sond, both day and nyght,

And graunt me grace of lyfys light,

And let me neuer de,

To thou sich grace to me send,

That I may handyll hym in my hend,

That shall cum oure mys to amend,

And se hym with myn ee.

or Y, lines 161-164.

A! trowes thoue these ij eyes shall see

That blyssed babb, or they be owte?

Ye, I pray God so myght it be.

then were I putt all owte of dowte.

In T and Y the speech of the Angels to Simeon directly follows.

But in Cov. there is a long scene between Anna and Simeon, rehearsing the prophecies again and closing with another prayer by Simeon after Anna goes out.

275. Now, lorde, that madist all thyng of noght,

Both hevyn and hell and eyuere creature,

Asse thou knoist myn inwarde thought,

Reycomforde (me), when hit ys thy pleasure!

Then the tyme of thy natevete

With my mortall yeeis thatt I myght se, etc.,

ending,

Or that I unto slepe do goo,

I commytt my warkis with all the circumstance

wholly unto thy lawis and ordonance.

Then follows the angel's speech. Both the scene with Anna and the second prayer seem like late insertions; where the prayer is used to make connection with the angel's speech, lines, 288-309.

Sc. 3, 310-362. Simeon and his clerics go to the temple. The bell rings as in T.

Sc. 4, 363-581. Mary and Joseph go to the temple. As in Y there is brought out the need of two doves. In Y Joseph has them, but in Cov. he is made to hunt them in a long scene full of ill managed fun, so-called. They end by going to the temple.

Sc. 5, 582-718. Angels call Simeon to the temple as in T and Y. He goes with his clerics and Anna to greet Joseph and Mary. They welcome the babe. The scene and play ends.

Three scenes are common to all three plays:—

1. A prophecy and prayer by Simeon, ending with the Angel's song.
2. Mary and Joseph take the babe to the temple.
3. Angels call Simeon and he welcomes the child.

This is all there is in T. In fact, the break occurs before Simeon has time to welcome the child. To this Y has added the scene with Simeon and Anna and Anna's welcome of the child. These two Cov. has also added, but in different places. In Y Anna is first introduced after the opening prologue and speaks a monologue detailing her career. She holds no conversation with Simeon, whose regular speech follows. Her speech appears to have been prefixed to the first scene in which Simeon appears. Her other appearance in Y is in a scene in which Joseph and Mary make their sacrifices, a scene which occurs neither in T nor in Cov. I have already noted how the first appearance of Anna in Cov. seems to be inserted in Simeon's first speech. Her second appearance as well is managed otherwise than in York, for here she comes in with Simeon and his clerics.

These scenes in Cov. in which Simeon appears with Clerics are a development found in no other cycle. In a similar way this cycle alone gives a humorous cast to the scene in which Mary and Joseph prepare to go to Jeru-

salem, and thus lowers, to a great extent, the tone of the play. Considering all these things, I am inclined to think that we have in T a remnant of the play which is nearer the original form than are the others; that the three scenes in T which are the only three common to the three cycles constituted the three of the original play, to which Y and Cov. made independent additions of the character of Anna. That these were independent is proved by the fact that Anna's speeches are introduced at different places in the two cycles and do not correspond to each other. That Cov. introduced the device of the clerics at the same time that the character of Anna was introduced is proved by the fact that Anna's second appearance is an essential part of the appearance of Simeon and his clerics. Says Simeon, lines 620 ff. :—

Then, Surs, cum forthe (with me) apase,  
And myrrele the bellis ryng!  
An(n)e systur, goo ye (also) with me,  
For to reyseyve thatt prince of (h)onowre,  
And hym to welcum reuerently,  
Ase of this world lorde and governowre!

We have thus determined that in the case of the Purification the same fundamental similarity between the cycles exists which we have discovered in connection with the preceding plays. This is an additional proof that it was a part of the original liturgical play from which the Nativity scenes of the cycle have sprung, and that our theory of cleavage in Cov. is correct. It further offers a solution of the difficulty arising from the fact that the Purification is out of the right chronological order in T as well as in Y. Its position in T is that which it had occupied since liturgical times.

*Scene 10: The Doctors.*

The connection in the Coventry cycle between this play and the Purification, as well as the fact that it is the only play on Christ's boyhood, would lead us to place it among the Christmas plays. Unfortunately we have no further direct evidence to bear this out, as the play as it now stands in both Cov. and T. is evidently a direct borrowing from Y. In T the borrowing is almost word for word. In Cov. it has undergone considerable editing. It is evident at once that such a word for word borrowing could only have taken place late in the cycle's growth, because it is only late in its growth that a cyclic play reaches its full development. We must conclude, on this account, that, whatever basis of comparison between the cycles may have existed, none exists now; that is, no direct basis. Indirectly we may come to some conclusion. It is reasonable to suppose that the late Y borrowings, whenever they are only portions of plays as the plays now exist, have replaced older scenes along the same lines that already existed in the T cycle. Otherwise it would have been impossible to adjust these new scenes to the old plays as well as has been done in most cases. Therefore, the very presence of this borrowing from Y is an indication that it has, in both T and Cov., simply replaced older scenes along the same lines and that the whole was a part of the Nativity in the liturgical source of these cycles.

In the light of this analysis it seems probable that the Christmas Groups in T, Y, and true Cov. grew out of the same liturgical source. The similarity in framework which runs through the series in the three cycles shows them closely bound together. With such a similarity it becomes practically certain that the prophetic prologue

was part of the liturgical source, especially when we remember that no Old Testament plays developed in Cov. and that there is no fundamental similarity in the Old Testament plays in T and Y. This liturgical source was more extensive than any extant liturgical play. Besides the Annunciation-Innocents series it contained scenes on the Purification and the Doctors. York is the only one of the cycles which retains all of the scenes. The Birth is lost from T and the Salutation from Cov. The loss of the birth scene from T is due to editorial revision. The greater interest of the two shepherds' scenes by the W editor has crowded it out. The loss of the Salutation from Cov. must also be laid to an editor, as Cov. was largely re-edited and as the T and Y plays show no marked evidence of a Transitional source. In one case, that of the Flight into Egypt, Cov. alone retains the original form. Both T and Y have evidently inserted a scene from a Transitional source. In T there is evidence, in plays 12, 13, and 16, that the W editor has simply re-written older plays already in the cycle.

This conclusion is emphasized by a comparison with the Chester<sup>1</sup> Cycle, which shows marked dissimilarity in framework. The Chester Nativity opens with an Annunciation without the Prologue of Prophets. This is followed by an extended Salutation, which is without the inquiry concerning the kin, and ends with Elizabeth's leading Mary to Joseph. The account of Joseph's trouble is merely an incident. The Birth introduces a disgusting scene with the midwives and in itself forms merely an episode in a long scene between the Emperor Octavian, his councillors, and the Sibyl. The councillors wish to deify the Emperor, who consults the Sibyl. She prophes-

<sup>1</sup> T. Wright, *The Chester Plays*.

sies Christ's birth, and after it has occurred announces the event to Octavian. He thereupon refuses deification. The Pastores differs from T, Y, and Cov. in a scene in which the shepherds make fun of Joseph, who explains at length his relationship to Mary. In general the Magi follows the lines of T, Y, and Cov. though much, if not all, of the detail is very different. It introduces Joseph again, explaining his relationship to Mary. The angel warns the Magi while they are awake. The Innocents differs considerably from T, Y, and Cov. Herod calls his knights together, and they boast at great length before going out to slay the children. The astonishing climax comes, when it develops that a child of Herod's has been slain in the massacre. Naturally he is displeased. The play ends with his death, for a Demon comes to carry him to hell. Then the Angel comes to Joseph in Egypt and tells him to return.

It is not necessary to carry this comparison further. It is evident that Chester could not have been developed from the same liturgical source from which T, Y, and true Cov. are derived. So-called Coventry differs even more, introducing a number of additional scenes connected with Mary's birth, etc. The divergences in these two cycles but emphasize the similarities in the other three.

#### THE RESURRECTION PLAYS.

In regard to the Resurrection Plays it is not possible to make quite so definite an assertion of the probability of a liturgical source as was possible with the Christmas plays. A statement of the points of comparison reveals a similarity; but it is hardly so evident as in the preceding series. Of course the probability in the Christmas series increases the probability in the Resurrection plays.

THE APPEARANCE OF CHRIST TO MARY MAGDALENE ALONE.

Vulgate, John xx, 11-18.

1. v. 11. Maria autem stabat ad monumentum foris, plorans; Dum ergo fleret, inclinavit se, et prospexit in monumentum.
- v. 12. Et vidit duos angelos in albis, sedentes unum ad caput, et unum ad pedes, ubi positum fuerat corpus Iesu.
2. v. 13. Dicunt ei illi: Mulier, quid ploras? Dicit eis: Quia tulerunt Dominum meum; et nescio ubi posuerunt eum.
3. v. 14. Haec cum dixisset, conversa est retrorsum et vidit Iesum stantem; et non sciebat quia Jesus est.
- v. 15. Dicit ei Iesus: Mulier, quid ploras? quem quaeris?
4. Illa existimans quia hortulanus esset, dicit ei; Domine, si tu sustulisti eum, dicto michi ubi posuisti eum, et ego eum tollam.
5. v. 16. Dicit ei Iesus: Maria.
6. Conversa illa, dicit ei; Rabboni (quod dicitur magister).
7. v. 17. Dicit ei Iesus: Noli me tangere, nondum eum ad Patrem meum.
8. Not in Vulgate.
9. vade autem ad fratres meos et dic eis: Ascendo ad Patrem meum, et Patrem vestrum, Deum meum, et Deum vestrum.
10. v. 18. Venit Maria Magdalene annuncians discipulis: Quia vidi Dominum, et haec dixit mihi.

Prague 12th Century Resurrection.

1. *Accedentes vero sorores cantent:*  
Maria stabat ad monumentum foris plorans, dum ergo fleret; inclinavit se, et prospexit in monumentum.
2. *Predicta soror inspecto sepulcro convertat se ad clerum et cantent:* Tulerunt dominum meum et nescio ubi posuerunt eum.
3. *Angelus:* Mulier, quid ploras? quem queris?
4. *Soror:* Domine, si tu sustulisti eum, dicto michi ubi posuisti eum, et ego eum tollam.
5. *Chorus:* Maria!
6. *Et illa inclinando:* Rabboni.
7. *At ille paululum retrocedens:* Noli me tangere, Maria.
8. Not in Prague.
9. Vade autem at fratres meos et dic eis, ascendo, at patrem meum et patrem vestrum.
10. *Chorus:* Venit, Maria, annuncians discipulis.

York, Pl. 39.

1. St. 1-3. Mary stands at the tomb lamenting.
2. Not in Y.
3. St. 4-5. Christ as gardener appears and asks her why she weeps.  
Why wepis þou sooo als þou wold wede . . . ?  
Whome sekist þou þis longe day
4. After a few lines of conversation Mary replies;  
St. 6, 38. Swete sir, yf þou hym bare awaye,  
Saie me þe sothe and thedir m leide,  
where þou hym didde withouten delay  
I schall hym seke agayne, good speede.
5. After some little talk, Jesus says, st. 8, that she is to behold his "woundes wyde."
6. St. 9. Mary recognizes him.
7. St. 10, 32. *Jesus:* Negh me noȝt my loue, latte be!  
Marie, my doughter swete.  
To my fadir in Trinitie  
Forþe I stigh noȝt yette.
8. St. 11-17. Conversation between Mary and Christ in which he describes his armor figuratively  
Mary rejoices.
9. St. 18. Christ sends her to meet the disciples and tell what she has seen.

ALONE.

Towneley, Pl. 26, sc. 2.

s at the

1. Not in T.

2. *Mary*, line 563. Say me, garthy-nere, I the pray,  
If thou bare oght my lord away;  
Tell me the sothe, say me not nay,  
Where that he lyys,  
And I shall remeue hym if I may,  
On any kyn wise.

rdener ap-  
why she

3. *Jesus*. 569. Woman, why wepis thou? be still!  
whom sekys thou?

pou wolde

longe day?

nversation,

f pou hym

thedir me

withouten

yne, goode

4. *Mary*, 571. ffor my lord I lyke full yll;  
The stede thou bare his body tyl!  
Tell me I the pray;  
And I shall if I may,/ his body bere with me,  
Vnto myn endyng day/  
the better shuld I be.

alk, Jesus  
to behold

5. After some talk, Jesus says:  
585. Mary, thou sekys thy god,  
and that am I.

him.

6. Mary recognizes him.

me noght

7. *Jesus*: St. 99. Nay, mary, neghe thou not me,  
ffor to my fader, tell I the,  
yit stevynd I noght;

ete.

ie

e.

n between  
which he  
guratively.

8. Not in T.

r to meet  
what she

9. St. 100. Christ sends Mary to tell the disciples what she has seen. Mary rejoices.

Without the similarity in the Christmas series it would be possible to draw no conclusions concerning the Resurrection series; with that similarity, it is possible to assume a probable liturgic source for this group. However, the comparison is made more uncertain by the fact that we have no text of Coventry, though the Cov. lists contain a reference to a Resurrection and a 1540 Castle of Emmaus.<sup>1</sup> The scenes included by Chambers in the typical liturgical Resurrection play all appear in T and Y: T, plays 26-28; Y, plays 38-40, 42 inclusive.

Pl. Y.	Pl. T.
38. The Resurrection.	26. The Resurrection.
39. Jesus appears to Mary.	26. Jesus appears to Mary.
40. The Visit to Emmaus.	27. The Visit to Emmaus.
42. The Incredulity of Thomas.	28. The Incredulity of Thomas.

Unfortunately the Resurrection scene in T is borrowed directly from Y at a late date and comparison is, therefore, impossible. But in the remaining scenes the comparison shows a common fundamental framework, as in the Christmas group.

The first unborrowed scene is the Appearance of Christ to Mary. The Y play is much the longer and more elaborate of the two. As it does not belong to the parent cycle, or oldest stratum of Y,<sup>2</sup> it has probably been re-written. While Y and T have the same biblical source, it is possible to establish a somewhat closer connection between them than this alone would allow. The biblical source is: John xx, 11-12; Matt. xxviii, 10. I have inserted in the comparison the Vulgate and a part of a Prague Resurrection Play<sup>3</sup> containing this scene.

<sup>1</sup> Chambers, vol. 2, App. x, p. 423.

<sup>2</sup> Davidson, pp. 137-157.

<sup>3</sup> C. Lange, *Die Lateinischen Osterfeiern*, p. 146.

The first scene, based on John xx, 11, is not in T. This can be explained as the result of editing; for the connection between sc. 1 and sc. 2 of T, play 26, is very abrupt. Pilate says, line 561,

The blyssyng of mahowne be with you nyght and day,

and 562 is the

Say me, garthynere, I the pray,

of Mary. The second episode is missing from Y. In the Vulgate the angels first ask Mary why she weeps, and she replies that it is because they have borne away her Lord. In Prague she makes that statement after looking into the tomb, without the angels' question. In T she addresses the gardener with the demand of John xx, 15, which is later repeated in its proper place. In John xx, 15, Jesus asks the same question, "Quid ploras?" which the angels ask in verse 13. Confusion of the replies is evident in T. It is not impossible that Y originally contained a similar speech by Mary. Christ appears as gardener in st. 4. St. 3, which should contain this speech, is defective, as it has only five lines. As Mary's first speech in T is repeated a few lines further down, it would not be unnatural to suppose that these missing lines in Y were originally similar to the T lines and were dropped because the same thought was expressed in its correct position a few lines below in st. 6. That st. 3 is a defective stanza is proved by comparison with other stanzas in the play. The normal stanza rhymes *ababab*; but stanzas 6 and 7 are twelve-lined, rhyming *ababdcdcdc* and *ababababcdcd* respectively. It might be thought, then, that st. 3 was really part of st. 2, making that stanza like 6 and 7, did it not contain five lines, rhyming *ababa*,

instead of four, and thus show that it is really irregular, being without the last *bab* rhymes. The third episode is common to all four. Y and T vary from the Vulgate in compressing all verse 14 and clause 2 of 15 into a stage direction (implied at least). In this way they agree with Prague. This similarity with Prague, rather than with scripture, is continued in the fourth episode. In the fifth, Y and T each has its own enlargement of the Vulgate and liturgical "Maria!" In the sixth episode the liturgical play has inserted a stage direction, "Et illa inclinando." It may be that T, st. 98, is a development of a similar rubric.

*Maria Magdalene:* Rabony, my lord so dere!  
 Now am I hole that thou art here,  
 Suffer me to negh the nere,  
 And kys thi feete;  
 Myght I do so, so well me were,  
 ffor thou art swete.

The seventh episode has a similar direction in the Prague play. The eighth is peculiar to Y alone. It is allegorical in its nature and evidently a later insertion. The tenth is not found in Y or T.

The scene is a good illustration of the fact that Y and T, though dependent on the same biblical source, are not dependent upon that alone, but have in common certain fundamental characteristics, which indicate that they sprang from the same liturgical source. It also illustrates the different ways in which even a liturgical play, although following the biblical source closely, may yet vary from it in certain particulars.

The next scene is the Visit to Emmaus, Luke, xxiv, 13-33. In both cycles it follows the account of the Vulgate, with certain distinctive similarities such as were illustrated in the scene above.

1. Y, st. 1-8; T, st. 1-16. The two disciples, meeting, lament over Christ's death. They recall his tortures and feel their own sorrows to be ever fresh. They rehearse the events of his crucifixion. Luke xxiv, 14: "Et ipsi loquebantur ad invicem de his omnibus quae acciderunt."
2. Y, st. 9-16; T, st. 17-33. Jesus meets them; inquires their trouble. They express surprise that he has not learned of the events of the last few days, which they recount. Luke xxiv, 15-25.
3. Y, st. 17-18; T, st. 34-37. Christ reproaches them and recounts the prophecies. Luke xxiv, 26, 27.
4. Y, st. 19, 20; T, st. 38-46. They invite Him to stay with them. They sit down to eat. He blesses the food and vanishes. Luke xxiv, 28-32.
5. Y st. 28-29; T st. 47-62. The two recognize Him. Wondering, they rejoice that they have seen the risen Lord. They go tell the disciples.

It is not probable that the extensive similarity in the first episode, a similarity more or less characteristic of the others, could have arisen from the Bible verse quoted. There must have been some other source, as the similarity is only one of structure and does not include parallel phraseology extending to common rhymes. Whatever similarity in wording there is can be explained as the separate translation of a common liturgical source.

The last scene is the Incredulity of Thomas: T, pl. 28; Y, pl. 42. This play is much longer in T than in Y. In T it opens with a portion of a scene in which John and Peter prepare to run to the sepulchre according to John xx, 3-10. But an editor has changed John to Paul in order to have this part agree with the Thomas scene which follows. There Paul and not John figures. The first scene is not in Y. This may possibly be explained by the fact that all the resurrection plays in Y have been re-edited—that is, are not part of the parent cycle.<sup>1</sup> So this

<sup>1</sup> Davidson, pp. 137-157.

may have been dropped. It is known that the Y cycle once contained six more plays than are present in the extant manuscript.<sup>1</sup> Or, it may be a late addition to T. But it is only the introduction to what was, apparently, a play of considerable length, and one can see no reason for deliberately borrowing this introduction from outside to prefix to a wholly different scene. It seems more logical to consider its presence as the result of a bungling attempt to condense two already existing T scenes into one, especially as the Thomas scene has been entirely rewritten by the quatrain editor. This would make it a late revision. The presence in the liturgy of the scene where Peter and John run to the sepulchre is so well established that it would be more natural than otherwise to consider that it was originally present in the liturgical source of T and Y and has been lost or condensed, as indicated above.<sup>2</sup>

The following analysis of the Thomas scene will do equally well for both T and Y:—

<sup>1</sup> See Burton's list, *York Plays*, Introduction, especially p. xxviii.

<sup>2</sup> Note in this connection the following more highly developed scene from Augsburg, 11th or 12th century (Lange, 182). I quote simply this scene from a longer play:—

*Ex post intervallum stantes in medio, linteum in publicium ostendes canent:*

Cernitis socii

*Tunc duo ad hoc parati, ex persona discipulorum petri et iohannis, et currendo ad monumentum vnum precedat, quo non intrante, posterior introeat choro cantent a:*

Currebant duo simul

*Interum sacerdotes predicti: cruce undata aspersa et thurifacta, pronuntient omnibus resurrectionem cantando a*

Surrexit dominus de sepulchro.

*Chorus autem, audit a resurrectiones, prorumpens in gaudium, alta voce communiter imponet:*

Te deum laudamus.

1. T, st. 12-18; Y, st. 1-5. The assembled disciples mourn. Christ appears and vanishes.
2. T, st. 19-37; Y, st. 6-16. Christ reappears; discourses with the disciples; is given food, a honey-comb and roasted fish, which He blesses and breaks and eats before them. Then He exhorts them in closing (In T certain disciples finish the scene with conversation).
3. T, st. 38-40; Y, st. 17-20. Thomas, without, mourns over Christ's death.
4. T, st. 40-73; Y, st. 21-28. Thomas enters and listens, incredulous, when the disciples say they have seen Jesus. They try to convince him.
5. T, st. 73-84; Y, st. 29-33. Christ appears again and calls on Thomas to touch Him. Thomas asks grace of Him and the scene closes with a paraphrase of John, xx, 29. "Dixit ei Jesus Quia vidisti me Thoma, Credisti: beati, qui non vide-runt et crediderunt."

The scenes both have the same sources and combine them in the same manner. The first part of each, until episode 3, is from Luke, xxiv, 36-43. Episode 2 ends, however, with John, xx, 23. Episode 3 is not in the biblical account. Four and 5 follow the account in John, xx, 24-29.

In the first episode in both cycles Christ appears and vanishes after the "Pax vobis," appearing again in episode 2. Neither biblical source gives two appearances, though John xx, 21 repeats the "Pax vobis." Here and in episode 3 the scenes show a common fundamental divergence from the biblical account. It happens that the Chester Thomas scenes (Ch, pl. 20, Wright's edition, vol. 2, pp. 108-112) have the same sources but have not the two entrances by Christ; nor have they the scene in which Thomas mourns without. This emphasizes the resemblance between T and Y. But this resemblance includes no common phraseology, except such as may be accounted for by separate translation of a common biblical source. It is above all a resemblance in fundamental framework.

In the light of these facts I am inclined to assume for

T, Y, and Cov. a common liturgical source in the Christmas series, and the same for T and Y in the Resurrection series. From whence this source is derived I cannot say, though the natural assumption would be from the Use of York. The Beverley list<sup>1</sup> bears out this assumption as far as a mere list may; for it contains, allowing for different grouping of some scenes, all the scenes of these liturgical plays. Beverley and Wakefield are near to York and would naturally follow that Use. Coventry, on the other hand, is at some distance from York, and I have been able to discover no indication, either that it ever followed the Use of York, or that it might not have done so. Unluckily there is no record of such liturgical plays in the York service. There are certain indirect references in the Missal (date 1509), which Davidson<sup>2</sup> thinks refer to the acting of liturgical plays, written down outside the Missal itself. With this idea I have no quarrel further than to say that these could hardly have been the old plays out of which the cycle developed. The Missal as we have it is later than the Final period. The drama grew away from the liturgy as well as out of it, and in its growth would have taken with it all the liturgical scenes. They could not have grown into cyclic plays and still be left in the liturgy. There must, rather, have been a period, about the time of the complete secularization of the plays, when the York liturgy contained no drama. This would also coincide with the period of reaction against drama within the church, so that when additions were afterwards made to the liturgy, they would be of the simplest nature. Thus we find left in the Missal the elaborate ceremony of the Adoration of the Cross,<sup>3</sup> which

<sup>1</sup> Chambers, vol. 2, pp. 340, 341.

<sup>2</sup> Davidson, pp. 18, 19.

<sup>3</sup> *York Missal*, pp. 105-106.

never received dramatic development, though so closely connected with the Easter Service. But the Visit of the Maries is compressed into the *Victimi Paschali*<sup>1</sup> sung simply as a Sequence without dramatization. Thus it is impossible to take the Missal as any indication of what plays originally grew up in Y. Nor is there any evidence outside of this common liturgical source to prove that the Use of York was ever followed in Coventry, during the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries. So the fact that the source may have been the Use of York remains simply a conjecture.

In addition to the plays herein discussed, the Towneley Cycle contains a well developed Passion Group, which has been subjected to most elaborate re-editing at various times; a series of Old Testament plays; a few plays on Christ's ministry; a play called The Talents and one on the Harrowing of Hell, between the Passion and the Resurrection Groups; and two, one on the Ascension, and the other on the Judgment; all of which must, according to a strict following of Chambers's theory, be classed as transitional. In connection with these it is enough for the present to say that many of the difficulties with respect to the plays of the Passion Group are best explained by considering them to have been derived, in common with York, from some late liturgical Passion play. It is within this group that the remaining plays, in which Hohlfeld traces a general imitation of Y by T, are found. There are no similarities in rhymes which would lead us to think such a Passion play transitional. This late liturgical origin is borne out by the fact that the T, Y, Cov. liturgie Christmas play must have been a late one because of its great length. But consideration of these questions

<sup>1</sup> *York Missal*, p. 129.

concerning the T Passion play must be postponed until some future time. Nor is this the time to discuss the Ascension and the Judgment, themselves apparently late liturgic in origin. It is sufficient at present to say of the Old Testament plays and the Ministry plays that they are so markedly distinct in framework from similar plays in York as to indicate their transitional origin and to emphasize the similarity in the Christmas and Resurrection Groups. But all these matters may well be the subjects of future discussion and analysis.

F. W. CADY.